S.P. T.R. 577 186 centuries. However, formerly the conflict between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, did not exist in its present day sense. On the contrary, the two parts had a sense of kinship, or even of unity, as may be seen in an examination of the motives for which Bohdan Khmelnitskyj gave himself to Moscow and to Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich (in 1653), after detaching the Ukraine from Poland.

S.P. T.R. 577 668 The conflict[1] between the two Russian nations did not in fact break out until the Nineteenth Century.

Its basic causes were:

1. The efforts of the Ukrainians to create or to revive a language and a literature of their own.

2. A whole series of scientific discussions upon the question as to what were the connections between the Great Russians and the Ukrainians, especially from a linguistic and an anthropological viewpoint.

Finally and above all:

3. The actual political and social status of the Ukrainians in the Empire and the general development in these latter years of social and democratic ideas.

/53/ Thus today the conflict is moving more and more from the literary and scientific field into the political field.

S.P. T.R. 577 668 538 The conflict began in 1798, when J.P. Kotljarevs'kji published in Ukrainian his Aeneid. From that date on there has been a great effort to create an indigenous literature. But these tendencies were quickly opposed by the government, which feared that this literary separatism might be prejudicial to national unity. And upon various occasions, especially in 1847, 1863, and 1876, it was forbidden to print or publish, save for a few rare exceptions, books in Ukrainian. But the result of these prohibitions was completely opposite from that which was intended. The tendencies toward literary emancipation asserted themselves so much the more strongly as they were more rigorously suppressed, and they found favorable soil in eastern Galicia, which belongs, as we know, to Austria.

S.P. T.R. 197 314 529 On the other hand, the conflict[1] strengthened by the scientific discussions concerning the ties between the two nations, became aggravated. There were arguments about the antiquity of the Ukrainian idiom, especially in the Kiyev region, about the question of

[1] [Between Great Russians and Ukrainians, cf. e.g. 116, pp. 35-37. Trans.]

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

thodius became abbot of the monastery of Polychron, in the vicinity of Mount Olympus.

The two brothers were recalled from their retirement by Michael III when Rostislav's mission asked for Slavic-speaking priests. Constantine in particular had demonstrated considerable linguistic talent on his mission to Khazaria, where he had learned Hebrew, and it is certain that both brothers spoke the Bulgarian dialect which prevailed in the environs of their native city. Upon accepting the mission, and before proceeding to Moravia, Constantine invented a Slavic alphabet, and translated into the Slavic dialect he knew a selection of passages from the Gospels.

This translation is the beginning of all Slavic literature, but the nature of the alphabet invented by Constantine is questionable. We have, as it happens, two early Slavic alphabets, the so-called Glagolitic, somewhat enigmatic in origin, and the Cyrillic, which is a combination of the Greek and Latin alphabets with some additions for specifically Slavic sounds. This latter is the ancestor of the modern Russian, Serbian, and Bulgarian scripts. On account of the difficulty of the Glagolitic, it was later supplanted in Bulgaria by the Cyrillic, which is relatively close to the Greek. On purely psychological grounds, but in utter disagreement with many much more authoritative teachers and colleagues, I believe that the priority belongs to Cyrillic, since Constantine would (I assume), if only for reasons of convenience, have used an alphabet as close as possible to the one with which he was most familiar. Then later in Moravia, when he found that the German clergy viewed with suspicion and hostility everything Greek, I believe that he devised the tricky and crabbed Glagolitic, which does not resemble Greek script at all, to disarm his opponents.

Accompanied by a few Greek priests who also knew Slavic, Constantine and Methodius arrived in Moravia during the spring of 863. They were well received by Prince Rostislav,

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

fortunes, not only threw off even the vestiges of a Byzantine protectorate but also extended its domain far into Serbia. During this interval Clement's activity greatly expanded. He founded the great monastery of Saint Panteleimon at Okhrida, and on Simeon's accession he was consecrated a bishop. The legacy of Constantine and Methodius was thus preserved in all its wealth, to the great advantage of Bulgaria, which thus became a purely Slavic country with an autonomous church. Simeon was accordingly able to realize his father's ambition of proclaiming a Bulgarian patriarchate.

Obviously the roots of the culture disseminated by the Bulgarian church, however nationalistic, were essentially Byzantine. Though a Slav by birth, Clement himself had been trained by Greek masters, and Simeon too was culturally so Hellenized as to be nicknamed the "half-Greek." Hence the literary productions of the Macedonian schools founded by Clement and his associates were, if not mere translations, usually slavish imitations of Greek texts. Simeon himself composed an anthology of texts compiled from Greek theologians. Though the influence of Byzantine letters during this epoch was limited to the theological and the liturgical sphere, it is of relatively enormous significance that at the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth the Old Bulgarian language was being adopted for literary purposes under Greek influence, and that a large body of Slavic-speaking priests was being created who were capable of transmitting at least the ecclesiastical aspects of Greek culture in their own tongue. The mission of Constantine and Methodius thus bore fruit, not on the ground they themselves sowed, but on territory closer to Byzantium, so that the results of what their disciples accomplished in Bulgaria could be easily drawn upon seventy-five years later when a much more extensive field was opened with the conversion of the south Russian principality of Kiev.

At the same time, the Slavic liturgy which had been proscribed in Moravia was also transmitted through Pannonia into Croatia, but in general the popes saw no reason to use it

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

study. It is therefore unlikely that Vladimir had before him any models calculated to inspire the establishment of schools in the modern or even the medieval sense of the word, but rather that he employed the priests sent from Byzantium as private teachers for the younger members of prominent families connected with his court.

At any rate, extant literary monuments dating from the last half of the eleventh century give evidence of an expanding nucleus of culture in Kiev itself which is the direct result of Vladimir's concern for education. It was hardly to be expected that a tremendous outburst of literary energy would ensue as soon as the seeds of learning were sown among a younger generation sprung from illiterate Varangian and Slavic sires, but the readiness with which Byzantine hagiographical and annalistic models were assimilated and imitated even before 1100 indicates an extensive interest in reading among circles brought up in a tradition of culture to the founding of which Vladimir contributed. That the basis of this culture was mere literacy—the ability to read the Psalms, the Gospels, and such Byzantine religious or historical compilations as had been translated into old Bulgarian in the days of Boris and Simeon—by no means lessens the importance of Vladimir's zeal for intellectual progress.

To Vladimir also belongs the credit for initiating the construction program which within the next century transformed Kiev into one of the most impressive medieval cities. The crowning structural exploit of Vladimir's reign was thus a stone church of the Virgin, begun in 989, for the erection and decoration of which he imported artisans from Greece. It was completed and consecrated in 996. At its dedication Vladimir endowed it with a tithe of his property and income, from which donation is derived its customary name, The Church of the Tithe, or *Desiatinnaia*. Originally a basilica, it was reconstructed with five cupolas after a fire in 1017, and collapsed under the weight of a crowd of refugees when the Tartars took

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

younger state in a volume which might have served as a firm basis for the development of a characteristic native culture. The Russians before the Tartar invasion were always pupils; they originated very little that was independent of Byzantine models either in literature or in art.

In art, however, this imitation was productive and created an architectural and a decorative tradition which lasted down into modern times. By the date of Vladimir's conversion, the basilica as a type of church architecture in Byzantium had been largely replaced by the cruciform church with one or with five cupolas. This was the type transmitted to Russia and still worthily represented by the great medieval churches of Kiev, Novgorod, Vladimir and even Moscow, though in the metropolis the more exotic forms and the onion-shaped dome derived from wooden architecture prevail. The highly conventionalized art of the icon dominated Russian painting until Western influences began to seep in during the seventeenth century, but this tradition was still vital enough before the first World War to influence the art of nineteenth-century religious and historical painters. For where the Byzantine tradition had taken firm root, the aesthetic appeal was long-lived and enduring.

In literature, along with lapidary works of religious implication, the Russian national spirit began to manifest itself in historical compilations during the eleventh century, and literary reflexes of folk poetry had already appeared before the Tartar conquest. But a truly national literature stems from a long educative process, and this process was interrupted in medieval Russia both by domestic politics and by nomadic inroads.

Where domestic disorders merely retarded the intellectual advance of medieval Russia, the Tartar incursion brought it to a full stop. It has already been noticed what material impoverishment it had caused. But the Tartar domination was a far more serious factor in the deterioration of cultural and spiritual values. The church, to be sure, was treated with tolerance by the Tartars because it preached submission to

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Russian poets with more form than talent now began to celebrate official occasions and generous donors with ponderous odes. Handbooks of French pseudoclassic literary theory, like Boileau's *Art Poétique*, were translated and annotated. The Academy of Sciences, founded by Peter's widow in 1725, included not only imported German luminaries, but the first Russian natural scientist Michael Lomonosov, sometimes characterized as the Russian Franklin, but whom, on account of the universality of his talent, Pushkin, greatest of Russian poets, called "Russia's first university." He is also notable as the first proletarian in secular Russian letters, for he started his career as a poor fisherman's son far north on the White Sea. The first modern Russian history was composed during the reigns of Anna and Elizabeth by Basil Tatishchev, a former collaborator of Peter the Great. The purely intellectual progress in the thirty years after Peter's death was thus considerable, even though (with rare exceptions) it was confined to the aristocracy.

It is a matter of record that when Catherine II came to the throne in 1762 she was already familiar with the theories of the eighteenth-century French political philosophers and would have welcomed an opportunity to apply them. But her position had been won wholly by the aid of the landed gentry and the aristocratic guard regiments, who were unlikely to surrender any of their prerogatives or to consent to any mitigation of the institution of serfdom on which their economic existence was based. The great empress thus contributed little to social progress, and her educational innovations remained for the most part on paper. Yet through her interest in the satirical journal and in the drama, she stimulated the progress of Russian letters even if her social initiatives were weak. In that field others carried the torch. A Russian customs official, Alexander Radishchev, who had studied at Leipzig and digested the liberal philosophy of the day, in 1780 fired the opening gun against serfdom, and though the exploit sent him to Siberia, its echoes did not die away until the institution was abolished. At the same time, the spirit of social service inspired

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

pean campaigns were inoculated with the republican ideas disseminated by the French revolution. Essentially patriotic, they were eager to apply these ideals to their own country, to abolish the autocracy, promote republican government, raise the standard of education, and do away with the abuses of serfdom They continued with greater energy, though often with little judgment, the task begun by Radishchev.

Here the Russian revolutionary movement begins among an enlightened fraction of the ruling class. Great writers like Pushkin and Lermontov, each after brief romantic digressions, grew up to treat the seamy side of reality, both in the tragedy of the humble who are scarcely considered human by those they serve, or the misfortune of the gifted individual denied a chance at productive activity by the contemporary organization of society. Both these talents were suspected and harassed by the autocracy, and though each met his death in a duel, they were as truly victims of official conservatism as those young enthusiasts who had participated in the Decembrist conspiracy in 1825 after the death of Alexander I, and paid for it on the scaffold or amid the snows of Siberia. But from 1825 the cleavage between the government and the thoughtful section of society, once opened, was never bridged again.

This mutual hostility first became acute during the reign of Nicholas I from 1825 to the Crimean War. The Decembrist conspiracy had revealed that the turn to the right by Alexander I after 1815 had created great bitterness. The same judicial and administrative abuses that marred Catherine's reign were still rampant, state finances were disordered, and the peasants were rudely exploited. Nicholas at first had some notion of reform, but his suspicion of extragovernmental initiative was such that he hesitated to take any concrete step. The most pressing problem was serfdom: the landlords were heavily in debt and short of capital to provide employment for a rapidly increasing peasant population. Peasant disorders were menacingly frequent, but only in the western Ukraine and in Poland were reforms introduced. Educational institutions were fettered and

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

pictures of the decaying landed gentry. Goncharov composed the classic of Russian imagination paralyzed by inertia. Tolstoi studied the peasant problem, painted the first twenty years of the century on the magnificent canvas of his *War and Peace,* and returned to contemporary agrarian and urban problems with *Anna Karenina.* Dostoevski, after poignantly describing the bitter life of the humble in *Poor People,* acquired still deeper sympathy in his exile, and having expounded his doctrine of atonement through suffering in *Crime and Punishment,* attacked the radicals in *The Possessed,* and revealed the whole scope of his psychological penetration and the breadth of his religious philosophy in *The Brothers Karamazov.* With other authors of scarcely less merit describing contemporary life, these three decades constitute an outburst of brilliance unequaled in any world literature. Russian verse of the period was no less meritorious, and even Russian painters chose subjects which reflected the contemporary state of mind.

While the aims of political and social thinkers expanded, the tempo of the reforms gradually slowed down with dangerous results. Active revolutionary groups had begun to take shape even in the heyday of reform, and strove for rapid democratization in the public interest. Even in the fifties, literature had ceased to be an exclusive perquisite of the aristocracy and was professionally practiced by many young men from the new middle class who were impatient at the slowness of change. Some of the young radicals made unfruitful efforts to form a community of interest with the peasantry. Others attempted to force the hand of the government by acts of violence. Marxist socialism became known in Russia during the seventies and, while it supplied the young radicals with a more aggressive program, it suggested a transfer of their missionary efforts from the peasants to the urban industrial workers who were expanding in numbers with the progressive industrialization of the country.

The rising tide of radicalism stimulated repressive measures by the government, which gradually lost much of the sympathy

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* 652 668 which it had previously enjoyed in more moderate spheres, and even rejected loyal proposals for conservative reforms advanced in order to discourage the repeated outrages of the terrorists. In 1880 the situation came to a head with an explosion in the Winter Palace itself at St. Petersburg in which the whole imperial family narrowly escaped a violent death. Alexander II then called liberal statesmen who enjoyed the public confidence to work out a series of innovations which, though not aiming at a constitution, were at least conciliatory and progressive. These reforms were viewed with apprehension by the radicals, who not only feared to lose their public but also believed (mistakenly, as it proved) that the elimination of the tsar would be the prelude to a great popular uprising. They thus assassinated Alexander II on March 13, 1881.

The results were devastating. Moderate opinion was profoundly shocked, the government relapsed into a reactionary policy which endured until 1917, only briefly interrupted by the revolution of 1905. Political freedom and even political thought were discouraged, and many conscientious liberals were reduced to disillusion and despair by the bitter conviction that progress was impossible. The situation was not helped by the economic crisis of the eighties which followed an inflationary period of hasty industrial overexpansion.

829 ●538 This disillusion is most clearly reflected in the dramas of Chekhov, those twilight pictures of a class which vegetates without hope of change, without faith in its capacity to influence events. To this situation the accession of Nicholas II in 1894 brought no cure; since he was largely surrounded by ministers who deprecated even local self-government as only a step toward constitutionalism. But beneath the surface a new 175* 668 spirit was about to break ground. Some of the younger generation could no longer accept the resignation which Chekhov's characters practiced. For them, failure, however tragic, was not an everlasting stop-signal. Marxism gave them a program and a method. It warned them not to expect salvation from the middle class, and preached the virtues and strength of the so

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

far silent but ambitious proletariat. The lower strata of society were no longer looking for sympathy. They wanted power, and if properly led would break down all barriers to its attainment. The voice of the grumbling dispossessed first sounded clearly in Russian literature through Maxim Gorki's early stories, which began to appear in 1892. The best example of the young intellectual who discovered saving graces in Marxism was Lenin. He began to study Marx's *Capital* in 1888, organized a group of Marxists at Kuibyshev (Samara) in 1893, and was a social-democratic propagandist in St. Petersburg the next year. The emergence of Marxism as an active political and economic system in Russia dates from this period.

The rise of the Social Democratic party and the foundation of the more activist section known as the Bolsheviki (the maximalists) headed by Lenin himself preceded the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war by barely one year. At the same time, another radical party, the Social Revolutionaries, revived the tradition of terrorism as practiced before the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. The government pursued a policy of repression even when the necessity of prosecuting a war for which the nation was totally unprepared might well have dictated a more conciliatory attitude. Profound resentment now mastered not only the middle class but the urban proletariat, and though the police resorted to desperate provocatory acts in order to discredit the agitators, a united front against the government was rapidly forming. When open revolution broke out early in 1905, neither the middle-class liberals nor the radical Marxist groups possessed an organization equal to organizing and directing a mass movement. As a result, after the government made various constitutional concessions and the extremists showed every sign of fighting to a finish, the moderate groups gravitated away from the revolutionary idea, leaving the Marxist leaders and the workers isolated. With the urban middle class again passive, the government speedily recovered its sangfroid and applied repressive measures of forbidding severity which were far from supplying any basis for

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

reconciliation with society. The new parliament was never allowed to function efficiently, and excessive parcellation of parties within it also prevented the formation of a workable united front against the government, though the fundamental tone was one of hostility.

The first World War began in this atmosphere of mutual distrust between government and society, and only a brief interval of patriotic *entente cordiale* intervened before official incompetence as revealed by repeated military defeats once more opened the breach, which was further widened by a complete collapse of transportation and economic life. General resentment was intensified by evidence of a total lack of comprehension of the situation by the tsar and his advisers, and culminated in the events of March, 1917, by which the tsar was forced to abdicate and a democratic regime was set up. The vacillations of successive moderate provisional governments played into the hands of the Bolshevik leaders, who could always bank on the support of the urban factory workers and certain sections of the army, and on November 7 they were masters of Petrograd. The subsequent fortunes of the Soviets are so close to our own times as to be matters of common knowledge.

The chasm which existed between government and society between 1894 and the first World War did not prevent simultaneous developments in Russian intellectual life. In spite of government surveillance and occasional restriction of educational facilities, a highly educated and talented middle class had evolved in Russia during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Though literature declined in some degree after the death of Dostoevski, Tolstoi lived on to combine moral philosophy and creative letters until 1910. Chekhov's later plays expressed his own prevision that an epoch was about to end. A younger generation of prose writers revived traditional Russian realism in a more individualistic spirit without regard to the political and social aims that had inspired their predecessors. In poetry, symbolism sought to penetrate and express deeper

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

most natural state is a state inhabited by a single nation with a single national character." This principle provoked a grateful echo in the minds of several outstanding Bohemian scholars and patriots. An ex-Jesuit, Joseph Dubrovski, the founder of Slavic philology as a discipline, was the first modern Bohemian patriot of nationalistic stamp, and his works gave to the whole Bohemian literary movement a pan-Slavist direction. He condemned Germanization, but not the Germans, and sincerely believed the Slavs destined to become the bearers of a new civilization. Through Dubrovski, the Czechs began to feel themselves a part of the great Slavic community, and expected to find support for their national aspirations in the new conception of a Slavic civilization.

Contemporary with Dubrovski (who died in 1839) was Joseph Jungmann, translator of *Paradise Lost* and of Châteaubriand's *Atala* who, by his compilation of the first Czech dictionary, revealed the wealth of the mother tongue and by his studies in literary history disclosed the richness and diversity of prior Bohemian literature. Dubrovski's work was carried on by the great antiquarian Paul Joseph Šafařík, a Slovak by birth, whose studies of the origins and expansion of the Slavs constitute a brilliant apologia for the Slavic nations. What Šafařík accomplished in the broad field of philology was duplicated in history by his younger Bohemian colleague, Francis Palacký, and these patriotic and scholarly efforts laid the foundations for a renaissance of Bohemian literature and of general Slavic intellectual life. The first models of the new literature were the products of the romantic movement in German letters, but Bohemian authors soon passed on to independent creation, and it was Joseph Kollár who, animated by his contacts at Jena with the literature of Young Germany, composed eloquent sonnets in which he called the scattered Slavs to solidarity and coöperation in the great work which he, as a disciple of Herder, believed was their destiny. In particular, Kollár preached a community of interests with the South Slavs, a principle which, had it been properly appreciated by

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the Austrian authorities, might have had incalculable consequences for the maintenance of their Empire.

The ideals preached by Palacký, who was as great a journalist as he was a historian, were first formulated in political terms just prior to the revolutionary year 1848, which signalized the end of Metternich's regime and the dawn of constitutionalism in Austria. It was thus Palacký who advocated an autonomous Bohemia including all the lands which had formerly belonged to the Bohemian crown, together with as much of Hungary as was populated by Slovaks: the principle, indeed, upon which the Czechoslovak state was subsequently erected. It is significant, moreover, that the German elements in Bohemia were inclined to support the Czechs in their agitation for autonomy. But the federal idea was never realized in Austria-Hungary before the monarchy dissolved in 1918, and Bohemian hopes in this direction were dashed by the Austrian Constitution of 1867, which gave the Hungarians a preferred position, as compared with the Slavs, by establishing the principle of dualism, by making Hungary practically autonomous, and by settling the *Magyar domination* upon Slovaks and Croats. This loss was to some extent offset by educational concessions to the Czechs, since in the previous twenty years Bohemian national consciousness had consolidated to an extraordinary degree through the increased use of the native language and the improved status of both peasants and the middle class. The romantic emphasis laid by Palacký on the glorious past of Bohemia thus proved an altogether healthy spur to the national ambition.

Though after 1867 there was never any real reconciliation between Prague and Vienna, the material prosperity of Bohemia advanced rapidly in the next fifty years, and the part still played by the German element in Bohemia before the war of 1914 is evidenced by the fact that, though they comprised only 37 per cent of the population, they paid 50 per cent of the taxes. But while the Czechs never lost sight of the federalist ideal, this principle was looked on with disfavor by the Viennese

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

of his successor, Cyprien Robert, from Anjou, was scarcely less romantic. After the 1848 rising he was suspected of having left for America, with the followers of Cabet, in search of Icaria. This sufficed to give credence to the idea that Slavology tends to unbalance those who profess it.

With Louis Léger, it is true, this science found its equilibrium and its discipline. But under Léger's guidance, Slavonic research tended to centre around Philology, and this orientation seems to have been permanent. The instruction gained in solidity what it lost in breadth; its beneficiaries, necessarily restricted in number, have never succeeded in forming a political team of Slavicisers such as would have given our diplomacy the orientation it lacked at the time of the two great crises of the present century.

Apart from what we may call Germanic interference, the Slavs have done a great deal towards helping to obscure or to emphasise their own characteristic features. What chance was there, in the past, of forming impartial ideas about the Russians from Polish testimony, or vice versa? About the Czechs, from Russian testimony? Or about the Catholic Slavs, from the testimony of the Orthodox? Outside an *élite* of thinkers, poets, scholars, who were the promoters and leading spirits of Slavonic Congresses, there was, between these nations, presumed to be of the same stock, nothing but rivalry, quarrels, and mistrust—piously encouraged, moreover, by their powerful neighbours. Denominational differences were stronger than race-solidarity; the Moujik felt that a Rumanian who made his sign of the cross with three fingers was nearer to him than the Slovak or the Croat who made his with his whole hand, or than the Czech philosopher, persecuted by the Austrian authorities as a 'dangerous Panslavist'.

The inter-penetration of the different sections of Slavonic culture was so little developed that the great Russian poet, Pushkin, was deceived by Mérimée's literary hoax, when the latter published, under the title of *Guzla,* a so-called translation of Dalmatian songs.

When Russian literature was revealed to the West, the latter greeted it with a defiant, or perverse, curiosity. *Monstrum invenimus.* French scholars saw in it less a new philosophy of life than an intellectual or sentimental pathology. De Voguë, who introduced the Russian novel into France, warned his readers

St Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

that 'The floating soul of Russia drifts about among all philosophies and errors'. He thought he was speaking as a Cartesian and a Catholic. But he added that this soul was redeemed by charity, humility, and that preoccupation with the universal mystery which haunts Dostoyevsky's heroes. He introduced *The Idiot* as a sort of clinical novel, the reading of which would be more beneficial to doctors and psychiatrists than to scholars. On the contrary, Jules Lemaître maintained that, in the Russian authors, there was nothing we could not find in our own. No doubt his temperament, imbued with the clarity characteristic of Touraine, made him ill-prepared to explore the twilight regions, so attractive to Russian thought. Yet Lemaître was nearer the truth than de Vogüé, in feeling that Russian literature would not impose itself by its 'Dantesque' aspects but by its note of sincerity and by its more faithful rendering of human inconsequence.

But, while awaiting a balanced judgement, which was to come only from the pen of André Gide, the picture of the Russian nation which the French gathered from Dostoievsky's novels was in the form of a fresco of grimacing figures leaning over abysmal depths, and of this picture they retained only the disturbed or less desirable aspects. 'Russia, Sir', says Lebiadkin, one of Dostoievsky's heroes, 'is a freak of nature—nothing more'. The well-read Frenchman's judgement on Russia would have been quite different if our nineteenth century had made contact with that country through the medium of Pushkin instead of through Dostoievsky and Tolstoy. The work of Pushkin, the most national of the Russian poets, would have created heroic, romantic stereotypes, which would have appealed to the popular imagination more than the Nihilist gospel of Tolstoy or the anti-Westernism of Dostoievsky. The 'discovery' of Gorky, translations of whose works were first published by *Humanité Nouvelle* in 1899, emphasised the revolutionary aspect, the reflected glare of incendiarism, through which Russian thought appeared to us; 'right-thinking people', and the conventionalists, followed its intrusion with increasing anxiety; for them, Russian influence or Slav influence meant one and the same thing, the revival, through ideas, of the tendency to 'bogging' under which Asia had submerged medieval Europe.

Russian art, on the other hand, cast around the Eastern world

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Chapter Two

RUSSIA AS THE PROTECTOR OF THE SLAVS, OR THE MYTH OF PANSLAVISM

186*
178
•538

IN a Latin treatise, published in 1826 and devoted to the universal Slav language, the Slovak writer, Herkel, uses the expression, 'verus panslavismus'. He was the father of a word which, taken in a political sense, was destined, after 1848, to ring through the world.

If the word was new, what it denoted was old. The notion of Slav solidarity, implying a more or less organic plan for union among Slavs, progressed for three centuries along the paths of philology and literature. It was originated by a poet, the Ragusan Ivan Gondoulich (1588–1638), author of *Osman,* an epic poem in the style of Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered.* He formulated the idea of mutual assistance among Slavs, with a view to the redemption of the Turk-oppressed race, by singing the victories of Prince Ladislas, the future Ladislas IV, who routed the infidels on the banks of the Dniestr. It was a hymn of gratitude and hope, offered up by the Catholic Slavs of the Adriatic coasts, and addressed to Poland after her ephemeral successes.

Shortly after Gondoulich, a Catholic priest of Croatia, Youraj Krijanich (1618–1683), spoke in burning accents of the 'Slavonic nation'; his work, a mixture of linguistics, history and politics, bears traces of exalted intellectual and sentimental emotions, influenced perhaps, in a confused way, by memories of Byzantium. In Krijanich is shown, for the first time, a clear consciousness, developed beyond the limits of a poetic formula, of the unity of the Slavonic race. Turning no longer towards Poland, but towards Russia, he had a prophetic conception of that country's rôle as a consolidating factor for Slav energies.
[198] Krijanich, a Croat, a Papist and a Russophile, expressed himself in a strange dialect—a mixture of Croatian, Russian, and Paleoslav—in the hope of creating an idiom of intellectual solidarity for use among all Slavs, whom he called 'our people'. The result is that we are uncertain whether to class him with Russian or with Croatian literature. Whereas Gondoulich saw

61 Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

no oppressor of the Slavonic race other than the Turk, Krijanich added the German. He was the ancestor of the Russian Slavophiles of the nineteenth century. He was completely out of harmony with his age, which could not understand an argument combining the Slavonic idea with Roman Uniatism. He met the usual fate of a precursor. Having offered his services as Librarian to the Czar Alexis Mikaïlovitch, he obtained from Moscow a mission to reform Russian spelling; the manuscript of this work was recovered at Tver in 1888. But it was not long before he was suspected of being a Papist agent, and was deported to Siberia, in circumstances which have never been cleared up. At Tobolsk he drew up a treatise on 'Politics' which, on the lines of Machiavelli's work, was intended to deduce, from the principles of good and evil, the laws of the art of government. Was Peter the Great acquainted with this treatise, and was he influenced by it? Unfortunately, that is a matter which scholarship has not yet been able to decide. After that we lose trace of Krijanich. A Dutch traveller relates that a monk of that name died under the walls of Vienna, in the ranks of Sobieski's army; such would seem to be the crowning adventure of that strange visionary, promoter of a doctrine which was to be revived two hundred years later by a pleiad of thinkers and scholars and which, freed of its denominational utopianism, will remain the 'credo' of the apostles of Slav solidarity.

After the capture of Azov from the Turks by Peter the Great in 1696, the centre of gravity of Slavonic hopes was fixed in Russia. If we exclude the Polish point of view, it remained there for more than two centuries. The three reigns of Peter the Great, Catherine II, and Alexander I, helped to awaken the Russian national conscience by contact with the Slavs of the Balkans, Austria, and Hungary. This contact set up currents of mutual influence between sister-nations, discovering each other after long centuries of isolation and mutual ignorance. A Serbian Academician, M. Stoyanovich, published a series of testimonies from Serbs who were contemporaries of Peter the Great, from which it appears that, from this time onwards, the Southern Slavs considered Russian successes as their own.

Readers will not be surprised at the omission here of any reference to the 'Will of Peter the Great', which the Chevalier d'Eon, of dubious reputation, was said to have brought from

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

part of the Quay d'Orsay. How great was his surprise at not hearing, during his audience, any reference to the Franco-Soviet pact! On the point of taking leave of Laval, he ventured to congratulate the latter on the results of his journey to Moscow. Laval cut in: 'Don't talk of it! I wish I could cut off the hand that signed the pact. Take great care you don't do the same!'

* * *

But, still more than the Western policy of the Soviets, it was their work of 're-nationalisation' which impressed the Slavonic world. The brilliance with which the commemoration of the death of Pushkin was celebrated, in 1937, was the first manifestation of this 'Russian drive' abroad. No poet was more 'national' than Pushkin, despite his African blood. He re-created three centuries of Russian life in a profusion of dazzling images. He rendered, more expressively than any writer, the escapist fever of the men of his time and the nostalgic tonalities of the steppes of his country. Great Russian Literature begins with him, and one of his compatriots wrote: 'In Pushkin lies our whole patrimony'. The *Izvestia* declared that it was only with Sovietisation that the masses of the people got to know the true figure of the poet and the meaning of his work. This paper heaped scorn alike on the 'vulgar sociologists' who made of him a wild revolutionary, and the 'ignoramuses' who found nothing useful for Socialist culture in his poetry. And the Government had his works translated into all the languages of the Union.

The extent of this homage was a prelude to a general policy of rehabilitation of Russian values. In the first Bolshevist ideology, Russia was represented as the nonchalant and sub-lunary being typified by Oblomov, the dressing-gowned hero of a celebrated novel by Gontcharov. Oblomov is a sort of Russian 'Triplepatte',[*] incapable of taking any decision, and established in the lazy, useless life of a country proprietor. We may say in passing that this picture of the Russian people is not a very true one: it confuses the 'moon-struck' state with inertia. Left to themselves, these people do sometimes lack application, or steadfastness, but if well directed, they are capable of prodigies of energy. For having dared to evoke this classical type, and the mentality to which it has given its name, 'oblomovtchina', Bukharin was accused of having borrowed 'a poisoned arrow

[*] 'Triplepatte' is the hero of a comedy of the same name, by Tristan Bernard and André Godfernaux. (Trans. note.)

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

from German Fascism against the nation which has shown the world the path of emancipation'.

About the same time a Proletarian poet, Damian Biedny, had produced, at the Karmerny Theatre, a comic opera entitled 'The Heroes' (*Bogatyri*), making fun of the heroes of Russian legend. Authority intervened to exclude this piece from the Theatre's repertory, on the grounds that it falsified history and represented as brutes or drunkards characters which in the popular imagination embody the heroic traits of the Russian people. And when he scoffs at the conversion of Russia to Christianity, the author sins no less against historic truth—'for', says the decree forbidding the play, 'that conversion was a definite landmark in the history of the Russian people: it contributed to the *rapprochement* between the Slavonic peoples and those of a higher culture'.

It was in the same spirit that the Soviet scientific authorities celebrated, in 1938, an epic poem which, to Russians, represents something like our *Chanson de Roland*: the *Tale of Igor's Band*, an anonymous account of an episode of the twelfth century, in which the author suggests that Russia perished on account of the quarrels of the princes; in short, it would be the work to reflect the first breath of national unity, had not modern scholars (and particularly M. André Mazon) sound reasons for suspecting its authenticity.

So, on the eve of the Second World War, the non-Russian Slavs recovered the picture of Russia as their memories and their sentimental traditions had formed it. Certainly, the Slavonic idea had nowhere been evoked by the Governments as an element in international politics. None of the political instruments drawn up in the period between the two wars takes it into account, or makes any mention of it. But the very precaution that the Governments took to prevent its evocation is sufficient to attest its presence. This presence may be discerned in the constant intimacy of the Czecho-Yugoslav relations, in the Serbo-Bulgarian *rapprochement*, despite the 'Macedonian psychosis', in the unavowed renewal of hopes which, in spite of their borrowings (or by very reason of them) from the dictatorial régimes, the Slavonic nations placed in a Russia whose features they had just rediscovered. Weakened or absent during the constructive, post-war period, the notion of solidarity again rose to the surface of Slav consciences, in proportion as the deepening shadow of a fresh tragedy spread over Europe.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

fessor P. N. Sakulin[6] "to the conservation of serfdom and of forms of life tied with it. Besides, Uvarov realized very well this spiritual relationship between serfdom and absolutism, and he definitely expressed the view that autocracy and serfdom, having the same historical source, must have the same historical fate." When the Chaadaev scandal exploded, Count Benckendorff, head of the Russian police and the closest collaborator of Nicholas I, expressed the following opinion: *"Le passé de la Russie a été admirable; son présent est plus que magnifigue; quant à son avenir il est au delà de tout ce que l'imagination la plus hardie se peut figurer."*[7]

The establishment of this ideology was not confined merely to official interviews, proclamations, and manifestos. The government had in its hands powerful means with which to imprison the thought of the country within its official ideology. The most efficient weapon was censorship and interdiction of foreign travel. The aim was not only to impose respect for the "three whales" of that ideology but also to eliminate any disaggregating Western influence. I need not mention the fact that in the eyes of the representatives of the *ofitsial'naya narodnost'* the West was considered a source of all kinds of mischievous and dangerous ideas. Strong echos of slogans launched by the official ideology often resounded in the writings of people who from a certain point of view might be considered independent. The most striking example is to be found in the works of a man who, by the way, was one of the closest friends of the Russian Slavophils—I have in mind Nicholas Gogol.

One remembers certainly Chichikov's troika "flying like a whirlwind" on the last pages of the first volume of *Dead Souls*, and one recalls perhaps that the writer compares that troika to a Russia "flying onwards like a spirited troika that nothing can overtake." "The road is smoking under thee," writes Gogol. "The bridges rumble, everything falls back and is left behind. . . .

[6] *Istoriya Rossii v xix Veke*, Izd. A. I. Granata, vol. II, p. 445.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 445.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 829 ●538

What mysterious force is hidden in this troika, never seen before? . . . Russia, whither fliest thou? Answer! She gives no answer. The ringing of the bells melts into music. The air, torn to shreds, whirs and rushes like the wind, everything there is on earth is flying by, and the other states and nations, with looks askance, make way for her and draw aside." Is it possible to read this astonishing "lyrical digression" without being indeed profoundly amazed, especially when one remembers whom Gogol's troika is carrying—Chichikov, Selifan, and Petrushka? This is the Russia for which "other states and nations" must "make way" and "draw aside!" From this point of view Gogol's passage is very characteristic and representative not only as far as the official ideology is concerned, but also the Slavophil. One cannot without amazement see cultivated Muscovite Slavophils like the brothers Aksakov, Khomyakov, Samarin, and many others absorbed in their idealization of the primitive Muscovite institutions and in their disdain for Western civilization.

The Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solov'ev, when criticizing this unjustified Russian messianism and pretension to obtain a privileged situation in the world, asked what benefits Russia might be able to secure to the world. Gogol, of course, had no doubts about this. His *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* gives a very eloquent answer: only the Russian Church "like a chaste virgin has been preserved since the times of the Apostles" in her original immaculate purity, and this Church, "changing nothing in the state," might give power to Russia and become a leader of other nations because of the inefficiency of the Western Church. The tsar is the image of God on the earth; the organization of the Russian State awaits the same state of grace: "The more one scrutinizes the organization of the administration of the provinces, the more one is amazed by the wisdom of the founders: one feels that God himself was invisibly building with the hands of the monarchs."

It is true that some of Gogol's assertions were too strong even for Slavophils, and his book awoke consternation not only among

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

people like Belinsky but even among some of the Slavophils. However, some of their own texts, which I shall quote later, and texts of writers close to them are not less eloquent. This, for instance, is the case with Nadezhdin.

We may find very similar items in a treatise written immediately after the scandal provoked by Chaadaev's famous *Philosophical Letter*. True enough, Nadezhdin wrote his treatise in order to rehabilitate himself after the unfortunate Chaadaev adventure; nevertheless the text remains striking. Here the author stresses particularly the power of Russian unity under the tsar's leadership, Russian health compared to Western disease, and the patience of the Russian people, which brought to their historical development a special character. "Who was the only one who thought and worked exclusively for us? The tsar! When did we write even one line in our history without the order of the tsar? . . . Our history must not be divided into periods of the life of the nation as Europeans divide their history, but into reigns which represent an unbroken stairway of beneficent activity of the tsars and religious humility of the nation. . . . Our spiritual life is not our achievement but the achievement of our wise and protective monarchs. . . . We have populated a space on which there would be room enough for ten and more Europes. Not in vain have we long been separated from the small corner called Europe. Our destiny is not to be the echo of the decrepit dying civilization whose death convulsions we witness, but to develop among ourselves a new, young, powerful, truly Russian civilization which will renew the old Europe." "The tsar is a father and Russians his children." "We are children, and childhood comprises our happiness. Our history has until now been a great poem in which there is only one hero, only one acting character. . . . Remember with religious humility and with noble pride that your existence is concentrated in your holy master. Without him you are only a line of zeros—with that monarchical 'one' these zeros make a billion."[8]

[8] Lemke, *Nikolaevskie Zhandarmy*, quoted by Jan Kucharzewski, *Od Bialego Caratu do Czerwonego*, vol. I, Warsaw, 1923, pp. 301-302.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

What is particularly striking is the arrogance of this constant comparison of Muscovite Russia with not only Europeanized Russia, but the whole of Europe. The later Panslavists such as Tyutchev and Dostoevsky will continue to drive in a Gogolian troika. Gogol himself knew Europe and was, I think, very fond of it—especially of Italy. In his *Dead Souls* he showed even a kind of Ukrainian hatred for Muscovite life; yet in his lyrical digressions he sang his peans to the greatness of Russia. There is an element of duplicity and insincerity in this attitude. The same, as I have said, will appear in the case of Tyutchev, for instance, a highly cultivated and profoundly Westernized man. Similar will be the case of Dostoevsky. Both knew the Russian reality, and in spite of that both constantly sought to announce, proclaim, and greet the "coming" of Russia into Europe.

Equally characteristic is another fact—that all these Russian nationalists fought with foreign weapons in their hands. This is a trait which appears continually in Russian nationalistic and imperialistic doctrines. Such was the case of the famous doctrine of "Moscow the Third Rome" and also of the Slavophils and their successors the Panslavists. It is well known that all of them were students and pupils of German philosophy—of Schelling, Fichte, and Hegel. They readily accepted and applied to Russia the German teaching that in different periods of history the universal life reaches its culmination now in one nation, now in another. In their opinion the historical moment for Russia's mission was about to arrive. The teachings of Schiller's *German Greatness*, which may be considered a kind of preamble of Fichte's speech to the German nation, could not but impress the Muscovite dreamers. Schiller explained that the greatness of the German nation is based only on its cultural and moral character. The German spirit is the only one for which "holy things exist." This spirit alone communicates with the spirit of the universe, which has elected the German spirit to work at the imperishable task of culture. "The English look only for riches," says Schiller, "the

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

slavists if these same Slavophils and Panslavists had no solution for the fate of a Slavic nation which was within Russia? As in our days, Poland was a test case, and without a just solution of the Polish problem there was no possibility of offering any more or less satisfactory solution for the Slavic problem in its entirety. And just here the whole system broke; and sympathy, justice, and harmony were replaced by pure violence. The usurping character of the whole doctrine and its demagogical essence became obvious in the light of precisely this problem. As a matter of fact, the Slavophils had a precursor in this field—and a great one. This man was Pushkin. And unfortunately he may be considered ideologically responsible for the direction taken by Russian political thought toward Russian-Polish relations. The intransigent and even ferocious attitude which Pushkin took at the time of the Polish Insurrection of 1830-31 predetermined the attitude of many generations of Russians toward Poland.[12] His anti-Polish and anti-European odes published immediately after the defeat of the Polish Insurrection could not but create an abyss between Russia and Europe. This historical event was especially tragic because of the fact that its creator was the most outstanding and captivating symbol of Russian Europeanism—a Russian who indeed might be considered the Peter the Great of Russia in the field of her spiritual culture. Pushkin refused to see that Russia's annexations in Poland brought her geographically closer to Europe only at the cost of moral separation. In his odes he expressed not only a violent anti-Europeanism and an aggressive imperialism but also traced the lines for broad Panslavistic, Panrussian conceptions. These vociferous odes, belligerent as they were, became a kind of poetical citadel, an arch of triumph under which passed one generation after another of Russian Russificators and persecutors of Poland as well as all Russian Slavophils and Panslavists. These odes became a canon, a national catechism, a kind of lasso thrown by the powerful hand of the great Russian

[12] I cannot enter into details of Pushkin's role in this case. I have devoted a special book to it.—Cf. *Pouchkine et la Pologne*, Paris, 1928.

Ts Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

poet over the heads of Russian politicians, writers, and poets. From this point of view it would be difficult to evaluate the enormity of the moral disaster achieved by Pushkin. And, as I mentioned before, the fact that it was just the great European Russian who assumed the responsibility for this makes it particularly painful. One has the right to say that had Pushkin taken a different attitude, the fate of Russian-Polish relations and therefore partly of Russian-European relations could have been different. It is possible, however, that my point of view is too idealistic and that I evaluate too highly the importance of poetical texts in the life of nations; nevertheless I am not at all certain that I am wrong. When examining the works of the Russian Slavophils and Panslavists—the Aksakovs, Khomyakov, Samarin, Pogodin, Leont'ev, Katkov, Danilevsky, Dostoevsky, and even Vladimir Solov'ev (whose opinions were in many respects opposite to those of the Slavophils and especially the Panslavists), whose views are so actual for our own day, one sees how completely Pushkin's poems were in accord with the basic tendencies of Russian nationalistic historical and political thought, and particularly with its anti-Polish aspects. As a matter of fact, the sources of the historic, philosophic, and religious inspirations of the Slavophils were quite different; Pushkin had nothing to tell the Slavophils in this sphere. Yet it is sometimes difficult to resist the impression that they had him in mind and that his "anti-Polish trilogy" was a sort of poetical noose cast over Russian political thought, the coils of which bound even the most courageous and the most spirited.[13] It appeared that the Muscovite Slavophil system was unable to find any solution for the Russian-Polish problem which would harmonize with the general conception of Slavic unity. The Slavophil systems, both Russian and Polish (to which I shall come later), failed to produce anything positive and creative: the Russo-Polish antagonism in these systems could be dissipated only at the expense of either Russia or Poland; there was no other alternative. This applies especially to the Russian side—to Aksakov, who in

[13] Cf. my article "Poland and the Slavophil Idea," as mentioned above.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

dilection for the Ivans of Moscow and hatred for Peter the Great were not justifiable. As far as the territorial expansion of Russia is concerned, the Russia of the Petersburgian period did not acquire or "liberate" fewer nations and lands than the tsars of Moscow.[30]

Besides, for every unprejudiced historian one thing is quite clear—that the universal achievements of Russia in the field of spiritual culture were genuinely connected with her collaboration with Western Europe. The Russian national genius was silent or inarticulate for centuries, and only when the magic wand of the West touched the Russian soul did the voice of Avvakum become the melody of Pushkin's poetry. How can we imagine all the great accomplishments of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Tschaikowsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov—in other words the Russian culture of the nineteenth century—without Europe and her inspiration? This point of view has been strongly stressed on many occasions by Russians themselves, first of all by Vladimir Solov'ev.

From the moral point of view the ideology of Danilevsky is essentially immoral. Where messianistic arguments are adduced in support love changes quickly and easily into hatred. Danilevsky pays some official tribute to the slogans of "brotherhood" and "Slavic reciprocity" brought to the fore by the first Russian and non-Russian Slavophils. But the essence of his doctrine is pure national selfishness. "Life and theory," says Solov'ev, "somehow very easily and unnoticeably replace the just and human formula of the national idea by the formula of violence and national murder. Not by any means do all the advocates of this idea directly preach subdual and destruction of foreign nations; but there exist roundabout means, softer in appearance although just as murderous in spirit. 'Our nation, by its historical march and by the natural succession of national culture, replaces all other nations who have passed away and are passing away.' This 'replacement' also is not without a cruel, bloody struggle and various national murders, but the final result is attained as if by itself. Such a

[30] This point, by the way, was stressed by Pypin and by Sumner.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

(cf. *ibid.*) However, as early as June 26, 1864, Tyutchev wrote to his sister: "I of course am not one of those who in their gloomy patriotism would like to doom Russia to permanent solitude, isolate and seclude her forever. I admit agreements, but on the condition that they be only *accidental* and that, accepting them, they never forget the truth-dogma, that between Russia and the West there can be no alliance, neither for the sake of interest, nor for the sake of principles, that in the West there exists not a single interest, not a single tendency which would not conspire against Russia, especially against her future, and which would not try to harm us. And this is why the only *natural* policy of Russia toward the Western powers must be not an alliance with one or the other of these powers, but *disunion*, division of them, because, only when they are divided among themselves do they cease to be hostile to us—because of impotence and, of course, never because of conviction. This severe truth will perhaps shock the tender souls, but in the end this is the law of our existence as a tribe and as an empire, and the only way of ignoring this is to cease to be Russian."[34]

The case of Tyutchev is perhaps the most fascinating. Belonging to a distinguished Russian family, a man with intimate ties with the court, a diplomat, one of the most brilliant Russian poets, the poet of the *Last Love*, the poet of the metaphysic fear of "the cosmos" and the universal "chaos," the poet of nature, the poet who created new rhythms and melodies in Russian poetry, the Russian poet who translated Goethe, Byron, Schiller, Heine, Lamartine, and who himself wrote poems in French, a man who was plunged in religious indifference and scepticism, a pantheist, an "ashamed atheist" who was "entirely foreign in his domestic life not only to orthodox customs of the church, but alien to the traditions of the Russian church,"[35] (words of Aksakov), a man who had an arrogant disdain for the "gloomy grey Russian life," in which he saw only "offices and barracks, *chin* and *knut*," a man

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.
[35] A. Lezhnev, *Dva Poeta*, Gos. Izd., 1934, p. 22.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

who spent most of his time abroad courting Germans, French, Italians, establishing very friendly relations with Heine, Schelling, and other distinguished poets, writers, and intellectuals in Europe, married to two foreign women who did not know Russian, a cosmopolitan in his private life, "entertaining German barons, poets, and diplomats," always speaking French[36]—Tyutchev became not only in his political treaties, articles, and diplomatic reports but also in his poetry the most violent advocate of Slavophil and Panslavistic ideas and of Russian anti-Europeanism.

There were, of course, slight distinctions between him and the Muscovite Slavophils. The kind of patriarchial democratism which characterized them, their adulation of the Russian peasant, their theory about the Russian village community—for all these things Tyutchev cared very little. His primary interests were connected with foreign affairs. He was the "minister of foreign affairs" of the Slavophils. Therefore the Slavic problem was always important to him. He wrote and published many political poems addressed to the Slavs and to the Czechs and poems connected with the Polish problem,—but again in a very peculiar way. When Murav'ev the "hangman" plunged the Polish Insurrection of 1863 into massacres and blood, Tyutchev addressed to him a homage of greatest thankfulness and admiration. And when the grandson of Suvorov, the famous hero of the Prague massacre in Warsaw in 1794, appeared decent enough to refuse participation in a collective address to Murav'ev, Tyutchev launched a mischievous and sarcastic epigram in which he made fun of Suvorov's misplaced humanitarianism. Besides, he, in 1866 wrote a poem glorifying Murav'ev's memory. True enough that in 1831 his attitude had been a little different. He wrote at that time a poem by which Poles have very often been lulled and which was usually quoted as a Russian pro-Polish text. First of all there is, I think, a kind of moral insanity in bringing the name of Tyutchev as a symbol of Russian-Polish fraternity; the name of the poet who in the most cynical way sang the glory of Murav'ev! Besides, even

[36] Lemaev, *ibid.*, p. 20.

71 Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

the poem of 1831 gives a rather peculiar consolation to the Poles —this is what Tyutchev says to them: "Believe the word of the Russian nation: we shall sacredly preserve your ashes, and our common freedom as a Phoenix will find its birth in them."

In the recent works devoted to Tyutchev such as those of Pigarev, Gippius, Stremoukhov, Lezhnev, one important detail has been revealed. Both the Slavophils and Tyutchev representing the landed Russian nobility, were deeply impressed by the revolutionary movements in Europe. Tyutchev in his anti-revolutionism, became a kind of Russian Joseph de Maistre and he very soon came to the conception that in Europe there existed two powers: Revolution and Russia. He developed this conception in his articles and poems and for many years he was busy with the organization of Russian propaganda in Europe for the spreading of his political ideas.

One of his[1] most significant poems in this respect was the poem *The Sea and the Rock*, in which he gives a picture of how the gigantic foot of the rock will appease the stormy waves of the sea. The idea which was symbolically presented in this poem was developed in a political language in his article *Russia and Revolution* written in 1848.[87] His conception of the greatness of Russia developed as a function of the mission which he attributed to Russia; and here his imagination becomes boundless. In his famous poem *Russian Geography* he mentions Moscow, Petersburg, and Constantinople as the *capitals* of the Russian empire, in which he sees "seven interior seas and seven great rivers from the Nile to the Neva, from the Elbe to China, from the Volga to the Euphrates, from the Ganges to the Danube—this is the Russian empire."

This was written by a poet who, although he revealed in his lyrical poetry his tenderness for the "original charm" of the "poor villages," "humble nakedness," "boring nature," of the "land of everlasting patience," did not himself care at all for the Russian landscape. This is what he wrote in a letter to his wife:

[87] Pigarev, *op. cit.*, *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, pp. 195-196.

1 [Tyutchev's --- Analyst]

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

"An immense plain—the Scythian plain which you didn't like on my relief map, where it spreads out like an enormous spot, is not more pleasant in reality."[38]

Not less striking than his *Russian Geography* are his historical views and the formulation of the Russian mission which we find in his two French articles *Russia and Revolution* and *Rome and the Roman Question*, and in a large work which he was preparing — *Russia and the West*. In all these writings he draws an apocalyptic picture of the destruction of the Europe of Charlemagne, of the Europe of the Treaties of 1815, of the destruction of the Papacy, Catholicism, and Protestantism. He demands a definitive formation of a great Orthodox empire, "the legitimate empire of the East, which will be realized by the absorption of Austria by Russia and the 'return' (*sic!*) of Constantinople to Russia and by the union of the two churches." The conclusion of these events will be symbolized by the Russian tsar as the Orthodox emperor in Constantinople, as the master and protector of Italy and Rome, and by an Orthodox pope in Rome as a subject of the emperor.[39] In his article *Papacy and the Roman Question* he constantly attacks all kinds of "usurpatory" tendencies of Western thought and seems completely unaware of the fact that his own conception represents the most fantastic historical usurpation—although not at all unreal in the light of our days. This is the way in which he ends his article: "Permit me to recall in conclusion, an incident connected with the visit which the Emperor of Russia made to Rome in 1846. One may still remember perhaps the general emotion with which the Emperor was received upon his appearance in the Church of St. Peter,—this was the appearance of the Orthodox Emperor who returned to Rome after several centuries of absence—and the electric flash which went through the crowd when it saw him going to pray at the tombs of the apostles. This emotion was legitimate. The prostrated Emperor was not alone; all Russia was prostrated with him.

[38] Leshnev, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
[39] Pigarev, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
[F. I. Tyutchev — Analyst]

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

a tsar but an actor" and expressed his indignation about "the monstrous stupidity of this ill-fated man." 186* 829

This was one missionary of holy Russia, a prophet who appeared before the world with "a crucifix and a dagger" in his hands. Let us now meet one who for the triumph of his Russian truth was ready to change his crucifix into a dagger.

6. Dostoevsky (1821-1881)

Without entering into a detailed description of Dostoevsky's well-known messianic conceptions about the "God-bearing nation" and all his speculations about Russia and Europe, which he develops in his novels and short stories as well as in his *Diary of a Writer*, I shall confine myself to his general philosophy of history. 186* 538 829 The first thing I should like to stress is that the book of Dostoevsky is a book almost as much about Europe as about Russia—if not even more about Europe. His "Russian boys" are constantly busy with the Russian God—but even more with the Catholic God—with the Inquisition, with socialism, European rationalism, atheism, revolutionism, and so on. And this is so in spite of the fact that in his novels we remain in Russia, constantly in Russian monasteries, taverns, St. Petersburg apartments or streets, or in some provincial Russian towns. Another thing which should be remembered is that Dostoevsky from his very childhood and youth was a pupil first of all of European literature. If one should try to discover in the texts of Dostoevsky any proof of genuine and real sympathy for that European civilization which formed his art and thought, one would undoubtedly be unsuccessful. He very often declaims his enthusiastic love for Europe, but that love is addressed only to the "holy stones" of the "European cemetery." On the other hand the types of Europeans who appear in his novels—French, Italians, Poles—as well as the pictures of Europe taken either from the gambling casinos, London streets, French railways, or Parisian department stores, are deeply repulsive—with some few exceptions: Mr. Astlee in *The Gambler* and

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* Dostoevsky's feeling for Germany, especially for Bismarck.
538 This obvious antipathy, if not hatred, appeared in Dostoevsky
829 after his Siberian exile. One would be willing to explain this by the negative impression which Europe made upon Dostoevsky when he visited it. However, I think that the motives of his feel-
186* ings were of a different nature. Dostoevsky was sent to Siberia
829 because of his European infatuations. We know how deeply he suffered during his exile and indeed how unpleasantly he denied his former opinions and appeared ready to embrace less dangerous and less politically compromising roads of thought, although in his situation it was difficult to be heroic to the end. Dostoevsky suffered because of Europe, and I think that this personal motive has to be taken into consideration. It would be useless here to quote all Dostoevsky's astonishing and fantastic conceptions of what he thought to be the real historical relationship beween Russia and Europe. We know that Dostoevsky was always ready to say that "to be a real Russian means to be a real European," and that some of his heroes felt when abroad that they were the unique Europeans among Europeans, that French were French, English English, Germans German, but only Russians besides being Russians were also Europeans, and have I to recall his really incredible and almost absurd speculations about the "Russian seekers"—Onegin and Aleko—in his Pushkin speech? Only an aberration of mind could bring one to assert that Onegin killed his friend and Aleko his wife perhaps because of their longing for universalistic ideals. Dostoevsky's deep belief was that only the Russian thought was able to embrace universalistic goals. By these trends of his beliefs he certainly closely approached the Slavophils and later the Russian *narodniki* as well as the Panslavists; and in his political articles he very often waved the banners of Slavic brotherhood, of a Panslav union under Russian leadership. And one easily remembers his piercing and hysterical shouts: "Constantinople must be ours!" But not all these slogans which, after all, in Dostoevsky's time had become trivial clichés, should interest us here. More significant, as I mentioned before, is Dostoev-

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

slavism of a special order, which would consist of grouping the different Slavic nations under the sceptre of the Romanovs as protected powers. This thought appears from the beginning to the end in the long Panslavist epos of the Slovak poet Kollár under the title *Slávy Dcera*. The poet visualizes the peoples as united to form a sort of Colossus modeled on the Babylonian Colossus of the Bible. Russia forms its head, Poland its heart, Bohemia and Illyria are its hands and feet. It would be imprudent to contest what the ideas have of the seductive and the dangerous, one must indeed recognize the exxistence of a Russian Panslavism, only one may deny its Slavic character and that it ever could possess the eympathy of any independent Slav."

C. Robert stresses another important point when speaking about the activities of the "great protector" among the Danubian and Adriatic Slavs. He would protect them on the condition that they would never follow the example of Serbia and show any pretension for a distinct national existence. "Let one look through the history of these Russian protectorates since the protectorate has been exercised over the last kings of Poland and Georgia to those which the tsar exercises at the present time over the Serbian and Moldavian-Wallachian principalities and over the crumbling Persian empire. One will see that these various protectorates have always had and still have as a unique aim to prevent the protected nations from rising from their humiliation and being reborn to independence."[87] More than that, the same C. Robert observed that during the upheavals in Cracow and Galicia Russia constantly played the role of an ally of Germany.[88]

On the other hand from time to time, as we may see not only in the brilliant articles of Marx but also in the extremely interesting recent publications of the Soviet scholar Tarle connected with the Crimean War, the tsardom was ready to utilize the Panslavic conceptions when they appeared advantageous for it. It is quite true, for instance, that for Nicholas I it was not easy to combine his

[87] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1846, pp. 472-473.
[88] *Ibid.*, p. 479.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

imperialistic views on Constantinople with a policy which would necessarily favor revolutionary movements among the Slavs and compromise the gospel of his legitimism. Nevertheless, Marx, Pokrovsky and Tarle gave, as we saw, striking examples of this Machiavellism of Russian policy. Let us, however, analyze the doctrine itself and try to see what were the concrete historical and cultural realities which it had to face. We saw that one of the chief problems, that of Russo-Polish relations, has not been and could not have been solved within the frame of Slavophil or Panslavistic schemes. But what was the general picture?

The main argument of unity among the Slavs was of course that of language. The Slavic languages belong to the same family and it is not difficult to prove that certain similar phenomena which appear in different Slavic languages represent not a result of inter-Slavic influences but an independent parallelism of development. For the tenets of the Slavophil doctrine the fact of a common linguistic origin meant very much theoretically. Language is an expression of the relationship between man and the universe, and therefore this expression reveals a—let us say—philosophical outlook. In other words language possesses an ideological value. On the other hand history differentiated the Slavic peoples. During long centuries they went sometimes not only through different but very often even opposite and contrasting cultural influences; and because of that the languages in their turn also differentiated to such a degree that Slavs are no longer able to understand one another. The amusing point here was the fact that the Slavophils of the various Slavic nations used German in order to communicate with each other. This was indeed a paradoxical situation for those who were trying to unite themselves first of all against Germanism. Of course Russia was and still is suggesting that the Russian language be accepted as the common language for the Slavs. But this generous offer has not so far been adopted. The linguistic divergencies become even more salient when we leave the field of language proper and try to apply the methods of unification to the field of belles lettres,

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

especially poetry, even if it be the popular poetry. A synthesis appears absolutely impossible. It would be enough to compare the Czech versification and all the changes it went through with the Russian and Polish to see how great are the differences. Let us take the Russian *byliny* with their assonances, which have no correspondents in other Slavic productions. On the other hand the *Shchedrivky* and the *Koladki* are ritual poems often inspired by historical subjects of a purely Ukrainian character. A quite distinct group is represented by the Serbo-Croatian and Bulgaro-Macedonian popular poetry—heroic rhapsodies which sing of the legendary Serbian hero Kralević Marko, the mother of the Jugović and her sons and many others. This poetry which served the fantasies and mystifications of Mérimée, which enchanted Goethe, Pushkin, Mickiewicz and Nodier, represents a quite special formation and a unique genre in the Slavic world. How different is the medieval Polish poetry, only semi-popular in its most distant origins, with its origin in the Church. Its lyrical starting point is to be found in the *Kyrie Eleison* and *Alleluiah*, refrains of liturgical songs.

Let us abandon for a moment this purely philological statement and turn to a more essential factor which determined the historical development of the Slavic nations: I have in mind religion. Religion divided the whole Slavic world into two parts. Bulgarians, Serbians, Great Russians, Ukrainians, and White Ruthenians embraced Eastern Orthodoxy from a Byzantine source. Czechs, Croatians, Slovenes, Slovaks, and Poles embraced the Catholic religion from its Roman Source. And in addition the Czechs went through Hussism; a part of the Ukrainians and White Ruthenians adopted the Union. The Muscovite Slavophils and Panslavists were fighting against Catholicism. By that very fact they were in opposition to the whole Western Slavic world. Religion determined the cultural differentiation, and if we add to that some other historical factors we shall see that at the time when Russia was under the influence of Byzantium, of the Bulgarian and Serbian messianistic literature which formed her

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

theory of "Moscow the Third Rome," based on all kinds of imported legends and apocryphas, Poland was shining in the sun of the Renaissance. She had her Rabelais—Nicholas Rey, her Ronsard—Kochanowski, and a wonderfully rich and brilliant political literature connected with Latin republican writers, some of which was soon translated into foreign languages, even English.

The Southwestern Slavs, the Croatians, Slovenes, and Dalmatians also took part in the achievements of the Renaissance. They lived that period in contact with Italy while on the other hand Dalmatia was under the influence of several Byzantines. Let me recall the brilliant Italianism of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the flowering of the Dalmatian literature which followed the songs of the provencals troubadours, and of the *Dolce stil nuovo*. The Dalmatian muses found their inspiration in Petrarch, Boccaccio, Guarini, Tasso, Metastasio; this literature knew all genres from *canzone* to the pastoral drama and *la commedia dell' arte*. The Czechs went through this epoch carrying their religious reform—a heavy burden but rich in immense moral consequences. It is probably this reform that gave the definitive form to the moral and intellectual character of this Slavophil and Slavologist nation, least Slavic in its spiritual physiognomy.

The marvellous flowering of the Russian and Polish literatures in the nineteenth century represents again a kind of exception among the Slavic nations. And in spite of a close parallel development, these two literatures very often, following the same roads of literary evolution, in many ways contrast with each other.[89]

So even if one should try to eliminate the purely political barriers separating the Slavic nations, such as the political antagonisms existing between Bulgars and Serbs, Serbs and Croatians, Russians and Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, Ukrainians and Great Russians, Ukrainians and Poles, etc., the problem of spiritual

[89] I have discussed these problems in a more detailed form in my article, "Existe-t-il un patrimoine commun d'études slaves?" Cf. *Le Monde Slave*, Paris, 1926.

and shares the fusion of *a* and *o* with the majority of this group. 197
Common isoglosses testify a close and prolonged neighborhood with Germanic, Iranian, probably Thraco-Phrygian and foremost with Baltic, which is tied to Slavic by significant innovations both in vocabulary and in grammatical and phonemic, especially prosodic, features. Old loan-words from Iranian pertain mostly to spiritual, and those from Germanic to material culture. Contact with Altaic and Finno-Ugric languages seems to be confined to the late stage of Protoslavic and has left but scanty vestiges in its vocabulary. The long evolution of Protoslavic, which took around three millennia, can be traced up to its final stage—the entrance of the Slavs onto the historical scene (fifth–sixth centuries), [175]
the oldest foreign records of Slavic proper and common nouns (fifth–seventh centuries), the formation of the first hereditary Slavic states (ninth–tenth centuries), the appearance of Slavic [508]
written literature (ninth century), and the final dissolution of the Slavic linguistic unity toward the beginning of our millennium.

The territory of present-day Poland, Byelo-Russia, and North- 175
western Ukraine seems to exhibit perceptible vestiges of the oldest Slavic settlements. According to the first detailed literary accounts about the Slavs, the sixth century A.D. witnessed a strong Slavic expansion to the South, West, and East. The Slavs swarmed over the Peloponnesos during the seventh century, but were eventually driven back from Greece. With Charlemagne began the protracted retreat of the Slavs in the West and the gradual Germanization of the Elbe and Oder basins in the Northwest and of the Slavic regions of Bavaria and Austria in the Southwest. In the tenth century the Southern Slavs became separated from the Western because of this continuous German offensive toward and the Hungarian intrusion from the East; later they were cut off also from the Eastern Slavs by the extension of Rumanian. While the expansion of the Western and Southern Slavs was curtailed and even repelled during the early Middle Ages, that of the Eastern Slavs has never stopped and particularly their colonization of the East still continued, checked only in the Bering Sea area in the late nineteenth century.

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

HISTORY OF THE LITERARY LANGUAGES

538
197

SLAVIC LITERARY ACTIVITIES begin in the ninth century with the rise of the first Slavic national state, Great Moravia, where two Byzantine missionaries brought up in Macedonia (Salonika), St. Cyril (Constantine the Philosopher, an erudite polyglot, formerly professor at the University of Constantinople) and his brother, St. Methodius, organized in the 'sixties a national church with services in Slavic. For this purpose they translated the Bible, liturgic and other ecclesiastic texts into the Slavic dialect spoken in the Salonika region, patterning it after the Greek model and adapting it to the Czechoslovak linguistic habits of Great Moravia. Since the dialectal differentiation of the primitive Slavic language at that time was insignificant, there were no obstacles for the spread of this Macedonian vernacular among the great majority of the Slavs as their first written and liturgic language. The literary activities of the two Slavic apostles were preceded only by a few primary Christian texts (such as the Baptismal Vows, the Paternoster, Credo, etc.) translated probably in Great Moravia in the early ninth century, partly from Latin, partly perhaps from Old High German, and preserved in later copies. The Moravian mission was forcibly terminated in 885, after some two decades of work, but it had given the Slavs many standard translations from Greek and occasionally from Latin, as well as original homilies, legends, prayers, and poems in a new but highly elaborate literary language adaptable for scholarly and poetic expression. Moreover, it bequeathed to them the lasting idea of the propriety and the necessity of using the mother tongue for all, even the highest, cultural purposes. This literary language, called by modern scholars OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC (Old Slavic, or inaccurately Old Bulgarian), penetrated from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries into the whole Slavic world except for its Northwestern margin. It produced several local variants: the MORAVIAN recension itself is known to us only indirectly through later copies made in other areas, the BOHEMIAN recension, which exhibits Latin influence, is preserved as far as indigenous manuscripts

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

538
197

are concerned, in single fragments of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and moreover local literary activities are known through some later foreign, mostly Russian, copies; the MACEDONIAN recension, particularly conservative in its vocabulary and phraseology; the BULGARIAN recension, which weeded out Greek and Moravian words and expressions, created a new rich terminology, and reflected the intense scholarly and literary life of Bulgaria in the early tenth century—these last two recensions are preserved in several manuscripts of the eleventh century and in many later copies; the CROATIAN and SERBIAN recensions, both manifesting a strong Macedonian influence and attested by twelfth century manuscripts; and the Eastern Slavic (usually called RUSSIAN) recension offering the oldest of the dated Slavic manuscripts preserved, Ostromir's Evangelium (written in 1056), as well as some twenty-five Kiev and Novgorod manuscripts of the eleventh century and numerous others of later date—copies of Southern and Western Slavic originals, and in a great part, local creations. This recension derived from the Bulgarian but later tended rather toward the Macedonian and in its further development has shown a repeated reciprocity with the Serbian recension. The Freising Fragments of the late tenth century in Latin letters seem to be a SLOVENIAN modification of Old Church Slavonic. During the twelfth century the language of Cyril and Methodius, wherever it appears in the Slavic world, is essentially modified; the Old Church Slavonic period ends and thenceforth we speak simply of CHURCH SLAVONIC.

With the Great Schism of 1054 and the First Crusade, Latin triumphed as the only liturgic and literary language for all of the Western Slavs and for the Western part of the South Slavic area. Of the Catholic Slavic peoples, only a part of the Croats preserved the use of Church Slavonic in liturgy and literature and spread this use during the thirteenth century, which in general was favorable to the renascence of Church Slavonic culture among the Southern Slavs. In the Czech state this use was abolished toward the beginning of the twelfth century, but its tradition contributed to the rise of a Bohemian vernacular literature in the late thirteenth. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, besides highly developed

538
197

belles-lettres, even Czech science and philosophy turned to the national language and adapted it to the Latin cultural pattern. Rich terminological dictionaries were elaborated; attempts at holding church services in the mother tongue were made, and under the Hussites they became a contagious precedent for the European Reformation. After a weakening of its foremost position in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, literary Czech resurged with the nineteenth century, exploiting the old heritage, borrowing from other Slavic languages (especially from Polish), and quickly adapted to modern cultural needs. The Polish literary language, which especially in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had been modeled on Czech (the language of the Polish world of fashion until the sixteenth century), reached a world status, first in sixteenth-century poetry and then in Romanticism. In the sixteenth century the Reformation inspired religious texts for the Slovenian, Sorbian, and Kashubian people in their mother tongues. The propaganda of the Counter Reformation, endeavoring to penetrate to the populace, and later the democratic tendencies of the nineteenth century reinforced these vernacular literatures. Particularly modern Slovenian scholarship and literature and their means of expression attained a high level. In both of the smallest of the Slavic speech communities striving for the literary use of their vernacular, the champion writers were American emigrants —the Kashub H. Derdowski (1852–1902) and the Low Sorbian poet Mato Kósyk (1853–1940).

During the whole of the Middle Ages the written literature of Greek Orthodox Slavs was prevailingly ecclesiastic and used Church Slavonic; lay documents and juridical texts, however, were written in the local vernacular. Secular literary works, such as fiction, chronicles, profane itineraries, etc., oscillated between Church Slavonic and the vernacular. Even though the last three centuries have strongly secularized Russian culture and strengthened the vernacular (Middle Russian) stratum in the literary tongue, its traditional hybrid structure, which differentiates Church Slavonic and folk components semantically and stylistically and distributes them in various ways, has remained the pivotal principle of modern Standard Russian and is still the main source of its

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

unusual richness. The political conditions of the Moscovite period created two distinct variants of the Eastern Slavic literary language: the Great-Russian pattern on the one hand, and the Southwestern on the other, which, besides a Moscow influence, exhibited a Ukrainian and locally a Byelo-Russian ingredient and which, moreover, was somewhat occidentalized through the Czech and Polish intermediary. To overcome this split, the patriarch Nikon, after the incorporation of the Ukraine into the Moscow Tsardom in the middle of the seventeenth century, initiated a radical revision of the Russian liturgic and literary language along Kievan lines. This reform contributed to the gradual Westernization of Standard Russian which in different ways during the seventeenth century imported a large number of Polish and Czech words, and then under Peter, directly followed Germanic and later on Romance models.

After a rich development in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Church Slavonic literature waned in Bulgaria and suffered a decline in Serbia with the Turkish invasion, diffusing at the same time a Balkan influence on both Southern and Northern Russia's literary language and giving birth as well to a new, RUMANIAN recension of Church Slavonic which served as the literary and liturgic language of Rumanians from the late fourteenth to the eighteenth century. Toward the sixteenth century, even in the Ottoman court and administration, Balkan Slavic speech came into use. On the other hand, the spiritual life and literary language of Serbia in the seventeenth century underwent a still greater Russian influence, and in the eighteenth century the native recension of Church Slavonic was replaced by the Russian pattern. In that part of the Serbocroatian world which adhered to Western Christianity there appeared, partly under the influence of the Reformation, partly after the model of the Italian Renaissance, regional attempts at raising the vernacular to a literary language with a Church Slavonic tinge. The most fertile of these were the Dalmatian schools of poetry—the western one flourished in the sixteenth century, and that of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) in the sixteenth and seventeenth. But the modern standard language, unifying both Serbs and Croats, which developed during the first half of the

nineteenth century, was only sporadically linked with earlier attempts: it raised to literary usage a folk dialect of Herzegovina and emphatically rejected Church Slavonic or Russian ingredients and the influence of any older literary heritage. A similar populist tendency characterized the rise at the same period of modern literary Ukrainian which was first used in the burlesques of the very late eighteenth century, and in its further development oscillated between the Western (Polish-influenced) and the Eastern (Russian-influenced) variants. Both Standard Byelo-Russian and Macedonian modestly entered into literature in the nineteenth century and acquired civil rights—the former after the First, the latter after the Second World War. On the other hand, modern Standard Bulgarian, likewise formed during the nineteenth century after some isolated earlier attempts, strongly and consistently continued to borrow from Russian and particularly from its Church Slavonic stock. Toward the middle of the same century, the Slovaks, who had used literary Czech (somewhat adapted to their own habits), inaugurated their own literary language based on the Central Slovak dialect but patterned after standard Czech.

Church Slavonic perseveres as a liturgic language in several slightly distinct variants: Nikon's recension is used by Greek Orthodox Slavs (and—with somewhat stronger orientation toward the old Kievan tradition—by the Greek Catholics); the pre-Nikon, Great-Russian recension is followed by the Old Believers; the Croatian Roman Catholics, in so far as they use Church Slavonic, maintain their own recension, although since the seventeenth century they have incorporated a considerable Kievan strain.

In the Slavic standard languages, besides Greek influence, prevailing in the area of the Eastern Church, and Latin, predominant in that of the Western, there can be noted a strong Turkic lexical layer in Eastern Slavic and in the majority of Southern Slavic languages, and a German stamp on the vocabulary and phraseology of Slovenian and of Western Slavic languages and on the technical terminology of modern Russian. To some degree all the main Slavic literary languages in their recent phase bear French imprints. Neighboring languages have undergone an appreciable Slavic influence, principally in their vocabulary. This is particularly so

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Historical Bulgaria EE2
Historical Yugoslavia EF2
Slavic Peoples E 16

Certain minor observances of conduct, which we have noticed throughout the so-called patriarchal zone, but which vary considerably from place to place, such as not crossing the feet, using right or left hand for certain operations, wearing certain colours, etc.—in short, at all times a care that everything be done in a way fitting to the conditions, according to some precise ruling of custom—exist because otherwise an evil force can be inadvertently put in motion, or a man work on himself or his associates some kind of auto-curse.[1] Particular care must be taken as regards children and domestic animals, who naturally cannot be expected to understand the importance of such observances, and must therefore be prevented from doing the wrong thing. Hence in part the arbitrary influencing of omens.

'I fear to go to the four parts of the earth, and over the whole earth,' says the devil in a Greek manuscript (sixteenth century) when he descends to fetch earth for the creation of man. 'Therefore, he made a sign of the cross with his sceptre, saying: "East, west, north and south." Thereupon all the earth came before God.'

The so-called Bogomil creation legend, slightly varied, occurs in Russia, Transylvania, in Dobrudja, in the Rhodopes, in Western and Southern Bulgaria, and right across the middle of the Peninsula, in Macedonia, in Bosnia and Hercegovina, in Eastern Serbia and in Old Serbia, and probably elsewhere. It is found in manuscripts from the twelfth century, in Old Bulgarian, Russian, Serbian and Bosnian books. On the one hand, there are versions similar to that of the Book of Enoch, the Vision of Isaiah, and the 'Secret Book' of the Bogomils. On the other, it links up a chain of cosmogonic myth shared by the Finno-Ugrian and Ural-Altaic peoples, and in the traditional version known to Slavonic folk-lore it is more like this latter.[2] It is of interest to note that an

[1] *v. infra.*

[2] Similarities between Slavonic, Finnish and Central Asian cults and mythology first came to the notice of students of Russian custom, notably P. Jacobi and Prof. Aničkov. The latter's views are theories rather than

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E 16
Great Russians RF 2

SP
538
795
171

early Russian chronicle attributes a very similar cosmogony to Volhs (*magi*) at Kiev, long before the first traces of Bogomil apocryphal literature in Russia.

The fact of the matter is, that most of the apocryphal literature, important for creating a new source of popular legend in the Balkans—e.g. the Apocalypsis of Baruch, Gospel of St Thomas, the Palaia, Vision of Isaiah, etc.—appeared in Slav versions, often markedly differing from any known Greek originals, as early as the eleventh century, and possibly before Bogomilism as such had established a popular hold or, at any rate, a literature of its own. To Jeremije, the Bogomil, is generally attributed the Slavonic version of the Elucidarium. Here, again, no exact Greek prototype can be discovered. Neither the devil's contract motif, nor that of his appearance over the primeval waters in the form of a diving bird, and other significant details, can be traced with any certainty beyond the Slavonic versions.

R
SP
773
779

Only on going westwards into Bosnia, it seems certain that the literary form preceded the popularised story. Otherwise, it is clear that the Slav writers of the Middle Ages made considerable use of popular sources, unaware of any inconsistency of doctrine, and tempering their material to taste. In the beginning, according to a Russian monastic writer of the seventeenth century, Almighty God resided in the three chambers of the upper heaven. 'The three chambers of the cross,' he says, in iconographical symbolism. 'The Emperor without beginning, uncreated, unspeakable, not born, not conceived, universal, invisible and unseeable, immortal and immaterial' was there before time. By his thought he gave birth to his Son. 'For the Father is neither created nor begotten, and the Son is begotten and not created. The Holy

substantial history, but there is documentation in his *Jazyčestvo i dvoeverie Rusi* (1914), and in more recent articles in *Slavia* and *Revue des Études Slaves* (VIII). More relevant theories are put forward by M. Arnaudov in Sb.N.U. IV. Older works include Spicyn, *Šamanizm v otnošenii k russkoj arheologii*, Zapiski Arheolog. XI; V. Bogoraz, *K psihologii šamanstva* (Etnograf. Obozrenie, XXII, I), where traditions of the type given above will be found.